11/10/11

Dear Dane,

The enclosed is not what I mentioned. it is something I just came accross. I'll find what I referred to. When I do I'll sand it.

I'll explain the situation but I'm anxious not to have any of it receive any more attention than it has because I'm still battling with both the FBI and DJ on this. In fact, unless they back out on their own arrangement, we confer with them and with the AUSA and DJ lawyers in the morning. My immediate objective is to break loose all that I can. To now it is - hold tight - more than 44,000 pages! Enough to keep me busy.

But it was only toward the end when the judge got good and P'd off at them they they stopped giving me paper like Swiss cheese. So we are still hassling on those earlier pages and on what I have not received.

I gave one to Les Whitten to pressure them. It appeared in the column this past Tuesday.

Tomorrow I'll see how they read it. It was not attributed.

Somersett was during the Swiss-cheese period but it clearly is Somersett. I've appealed that withholding.

The papers down there have probably had a Sturgis-Lorenz-Perez Jiminez field day what with her supposedly sleeping with both Perez Jiminez and Castro and now with all the b.s. about Oswald. I understand that for a while she was an FBI criminal informant. So she'd be able to show she was in their offices, things like that. But the rest of her story is n.g. I caught her on Good Morning America and read the original one in the NY Daily News. I also saw Sturgis with Rothblatt on the same show a day earlier. R, who is a good lawyer, is a bad reporter. All the things he said the Warren Commission ignored about Oswald in Mexico it did not ignore. It had to work around so it did, with equivocations, evasions and omissions. It did investigate that, but very badly, not even getting from the CIA what it had.

Best to you all, with and without tails,